28

Peter Stroinik, 1 2375 East Camelback Road Suite 600 2 Phoenix, Arizona 85016 Telephone: (602) 524-6602 3 ps@stroinik.com 4 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT 5 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON 6 1831 1.8: CV 7 Peter Strojnik, **VERIFIED COMPLAINT** 8 9 Plaintiff, 1. Americans with Disabilities Act 10 2. Negligence 11 VS. JURY TRIAL REQUESTED 12 Swantown Inn & Spa LLC dba Swantown Inn & Spa 13 14 Defendant. 15 16 1. Plaintiff brings this action pursuant to the (1) Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 17 U.S.C. §12101 et seq. and corresponding regulations, 28 CFR Part 36 and 18 Department of Justice Standards for Accessible Design ("ADA") and (2) common 19 law of negligence per se. 20 **PARTIES** 2. Plaintiff Peter Strojnik is a veteran and a disabled person as defined by the ADA. 21 3. Plaintiff is a single man currently residing in Maricopa County, Arizona. Plaintiff is 22 and, at all times relevant hereto has been, legally disabled by virtue of a severe 23 right-sided neural foraminal stenosis with symptoms of femoral neuropathy, prostate 24 cancer and renal cancer, degenerative right knee and is therefore a member of a 25 protected class under the ADA. 26

4. Plaintiff suffers from physical impairments described above which impairments

substantially limit his major life activities. Plaintiff walks with difficulty and pain

and requires compliant mobility accessible features at places of public accommodation. Plaintiff's impairment is constant, but the degree of pain is episodic ranging from dull and numbing pain to extreme and excruciating agony.

5. Defendant, owns, operates leases or leases to a lodging business ("Hotel") located at 1431 11th Avenue SE, Olympia, WA 98501 which is a public accommodation pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181(7)(A) which offers public lodging services *See* 28 CFR §36.104 and a listing of public accommodations in 42 U.S.C. §12181(7).

JURISDICTION

- 6. District Court has jurisdiction over this case or controversy by virtue of 28 U.S.C. §§ 28-1331 and 42 U.S.C. § 12188 and 28 U.S.C. § 1367.
- 7. Plaintiff brings this action as a private attorney general who has been personally subjected to discrimination on the basis of his disability, *see* 42 U.S.C. §12188 and 28 CFR §36.501.
- 8. This Court has continuing subject matter jurisdiction by virtue of, *inter alia*, Plaintiff's claim for equitable nominal damages.
- 9. Venue is proper pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1391.
- 10. The ADAAG violations in this Verified Complaint relate to barriers to Plaintiffs mobility. This impairs Plaintiff's full and equal access to the Hotel which, in turn, constitutes discrimination satisfying the "injury in fact" requirement of Article III of the United States Constitution.
- 11. Plaintiff is deterred from visiting the Hotel based on Plaintiff's knowledge that the Hotel is not ADA compliant as such compliance relates to Plaintiff's disability.
- 12. Plaintiff intends to visit Defendant's Hotel at a specific time when the Defendant's noncompliant Hotel becomes fully compliant with ADAAG; just as a disabled individual who intends to return to a noncompliant facility suffers an imminent injury from the facility's existing or imminently threatened noncompliance with the ADA, a plaintiff who is deterred from patronizing a store suffers the ongoing actual injury of lack of access to the Hotel.

COUNT ONE

Violation of Plaintiff's Civil Rights under the ADA

13. Plaintiff realleges all allegations heretofore set forth.

14. By virtue of his disability, Plaintiff requires an ADA compliant lodging facility particularly applicable to his mobility, both ambulatory and wheelchair assisted.

 15. Plaintiff intended to vacation in Washington and therefore, reviewed vacation booking websites as documented in Addendum A.

16. Air booking websites took Plaintiff to third party hotel booking websites as documented in Addendum A.

17. Plaintiff became aware that third party booking websites disclosed general availability and description of Defendant's Hotel. Third Party booking websites referenced here are more fully documented in Addendum A which is by this reference incorporated herein.

18. Third party booking websites failed to identify and describe mobility related accessibility features and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether Defendant's Hotel meets his accessibility needs as more fully documented in Addendum A.

19. Third party booking websites also failed to make reservations for accessible guest rooms available in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible

rooms. See Addendum A.

20. Thereafter, Plaintiff became aware that Defendant's 1st party booking website failed to identify and describe mobility related accessibility features and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently whether Defendant's Hotel meets his accessibility

21. Plaintiff also became aware that Defendant's 1st party booking website failed to make reservations for accessible guest rooms available in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible rooms. *See* Addendum A.

needs as more fully documented. See Addendum A.

22. Because third and first party booking agents failed to identify and describe mobility related accessibility features and guest rooms offered through its reservations service in enough detail to reasonably permit Plaintiff to assess independently

whether Defendant's Hotel meets his accessibility needs Plaintiff declined to book a room there and because Plaintiff was unable to make reservations for accessible guest rooms available in the same manner as individuals who do not need accessible rooms, Plaintiff declined to book a room there.

- 23. Plaintiff thereafter reviewed Defendant's online information relating to accessibility or lack thereof, including in particular photographs of the amenities at the Hotel all as more fully documented in Addendum A.
- 24. Online information relating to accessibility or lack thereof disclosed Defendant's non-compliance with architectural barriers to accessibility as more fully documented in Addendum A.
- 25. Defendant has violated the ADA by denying Plaintiff equal access to its public accommodation on the basis of his disability as outlined above and as outlined in Addendum A.
- 26. The ADA violations described in Addendum A relate to Plaintiff's disability and interfere with Plaintiff's full and complete enjoyment of the Hotel.
- 27. As a result of the deficiencies described above, Plaintiff declined to book a room at Defendant's Hotel and lodged elsewhere.
- 28. The removal of accessibility barriers listed above is readily achievable.
- 29. As a direct and proximate result of ADA Violations, Defendant's failure to remove accessibility barriers prevented Plaintiff from equal access to the Defendant's public accommodation.

WHEREFORE, Plaintiff prays for all relief as follows:

- A. Relief described in 42 U.S.C. §2000a 3; and
- B. Relief described in 42 U.S.C. § 12188(a) and (b) and, particularly -
- C. Injunctive relief order to alter Defendant's place of public accommodation to make it readily accessible to and usable by ALL individuals with disabilities; and
- D. Requiring the provision of an auxiliary aid or service, modification of a
 policy, or provision of alternative methods, to the extent required by
 Subchapter III of the ADA; and

Case 2:18-cv-01831-RBL Document 1 Filed 12/18/18 Page 6 of 7

Эij

716//1

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRESS FIRMLY TO SEAL

PRIORITY POSTAGE REGI

Peter Strojnik, Esq. Strojnik, P.C.

2375 E. Camelback Road, Ste 600 Phoenix, Arizona 85016

DATE C

2 機服銀展

Retail US POSTAGE PAID

\$6.70 Origin: 85020 12/13/18 0363900081-08

700 Stewart Street

Suite 2310

Seattle, WA 98101

US District Court

Clerk's Office

PRIORITY MAIL 2-Day ®

1004 1 Lb 10.30 Oz

EXPECTED DELIVERY DAY: 12/17/18

C028

SHIP TO: 700 STEWART ST STE 2310 SEATTLE WA 98101-4442

USPS TRACKING NUMBER



VISIT US AT USPS.COM ORDER FREE SUPPLIES ONLINE

